



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,282	02/14/2000	Dung Le Huynh	230074-0223	6335

7590 10/21/2002

Ted R Rittmaster Esq
Foley & Lardner
2029 Century Park East
Suite 3500
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3021

EXAMINER

SONG, HOSUK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,282

Applicant(s)

HUYNH

Examiner

HO S. SONG

Art Unit

2131



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 31, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2131

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 103

2. The previous action is incorporated by reference in its entirety. Particularly, the specific indication of various claim elements which will not be reiterated in this action. The statutory basis for each rejection is repeated below:

a. Claims 5-7,15-22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu et al.(US 5,774,551).

b. Claims 8-21,15,22,23-31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Wu et al.(US 5,774,551).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-4 are allowed.

In claim 1, the prior art of record does not teach a second data bus from the encryption processing unit to each authentication unit,including a data bus from the first authentication processing unit to the second authentication processing unit.

Claims 2-4 are allowed because of dependency.

Art Unit: 2131

Response to Amendment

4. The Office has located the IDS filed 6/4/01 (assigned paper #5). The references cited have been considered and a copy of the IDS is supplied as an attachment to this mailing.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/31/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that in Wu's patent, each of the authentication services 109, along with any encryption service, is necessarily processed by Wu's single processor 115 and since Wu employs a single processor 115, Wu does not disclose the multiple processing units recited in claim 1. ***In response:*** first, Wu does disclose multiple processing units (token#311, CPU#115, RSA and UNIX unit as part of authentication service). Second, Wu discloses more than one processor. Fig.1 shows CPU#115 and fig.3 token#311. The token#311 is an encryption unit in which col.2, lines 12-15 discloses that authentication token include password, public keys, private keys, etc. Third, RSA and UNIX are separate system or unit which are part of authentication service (#109) responsible for authenticating its users (col.8, lines 61-65). Note in col.15, lines 54-63, Wu discloses that authentication service can be hardware/firmware based mechanism. Lastly, applicant is not claiming multiple processor, applicant is claiming multiple processing unit and Wu's patent clearly teaches multiple processing unit as discussed above. Further, it is true that encryption processing unit can be part of authentication service. However, external device such as token or smart card can perform encryption function as disclosed by Wu. ***Applicant states that*** "the examiner suggests that Wu's pluggable account

Art Unit: 2131

management interface 123 is not a bus at all, but rather it is a library of software methods that the system invokes to obtain functionality from certain service. ***In response:*** the examiner did not suggest that pluggable account management interface 123 is a bus. In fact, the examiner agree with the applicant that pluggable account management is not a bus that it is a collection of software. However, what examiner suggested was that pluggable account management interface 123 is part of memory 101 in which ***data bus*** is connected with CPU 115. The examiner asserts that second data bus is a connection between token and system entry service or storage(#129) which stores token and CPU 115(see fig.1, 3).

Applicant has argued that Wu does not disclose a data input bus coupled to a processor bus. ***In response:*** Wu disclose data input bus coupled to a processor bus in data bus connection between token and system entry service or storage(#129) which stores token and CPU 115(see fig.1, 3).

Applicant argues that authentication services which the examiner refers are actually computer programs and there could be no hardwire lines or bus connecting them. ***In response:*** note that in col.15,lines 58-63, Wu discloses authentication services can be hardware/firmware.

Applicant has argued that Wu does not disclose a plurality of processing units. In response: the examiner disagree, Wu does disclose multiple processing units (token#311,CPU#115,RSA and UNIX unit as part of authentication service). ***Applicant has argued that*** Wu does not disclose communicating output data from a first processing unit to a second processing unit when the first processing unit completes its processing so that the first processing unit can process another data packet. ***In response:*** multiple processing units processing its data are discussed in above and

Art Unit: 2131

fig.1. *Applicant has argued that* features recited in claim 4 are neither obvious nor well known in the art and that applicant requests that the examiner cite a reference or references disclosing these features. *In response:* the examiner has provided a reference(US 5,987,126) in the office action(paper#8) in support of Official notice. *Applicant has argued that* Wu does not disclose employing a multiple processor configuration with a data bus, as soon as a single encryption processor completes encryption processing of a first packet and that the applicant requests the examiner to provide a reference disclosing multiple processors to process two data packets simultaneously. *In response:* applicant does not claim multiple processor, rather applicant claims multiple processing unit. The examiner asserts that processing unit can be a software module. Further, applicant has not provided any substantial information,evidence or argument challenging the taking of Official notice in the rejection of these claims. See MPEP 2144.03.

Conclusion

6 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

Art Unit: 2131

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ho S. Song whose telephone number (703)305-0042. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 6:00 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes can be reached at (703)305-9711.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or preceding should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Ho Song

Gail Hayes
GAIL HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100